



## **CJIS Executive Committee Meeting**

Thursday, January 10, 2008 1:15pm – 3:15 pm  
State Capitol – Ft. Union Room, Bismarck, ND

**Executive Committee Members present:** Charles Placek – DOCR, Nancy Walz – ITD, Paul Hendrickson – Griggs County SO, Julie Lawyer – Burleigh County SA, Dave Kleppe - Highway Patrol, Jerry Kemmet – BCI, Pat Heinert – Burleigh County SO, Daryl Vance – Watford City PD, Keith Witt – Bismarck PD, Kelly Jenke, Nelson County SO

**Members absent:**, Wade Enget - Mountrail County SA, Russ Timmreck – Department of Emergency Services, Sally Holewa – Supreme Court Department

**Others present:** Pam Schafer, Tamara Schatz, Gordon Christensen (CJIS Staff), Sue Davenport, ITD

### **1. Approve Meeting Minutes**

- Keith made a motion to approve the minutes, Nancy seconds, Motion approved.

### **2. CJIS Staff**

- Darin Anderson has accepted the CJIS System Support Specialist. He currently works for Job Service and has prior experience with a South Dakota Correctional Facility and South Dakota's NIBR's program. His start date is Monday, January 14, 2008. The position resides within ITD.

### **3. CJIS Status Report**

- Monthly status of the CJIS Hub, LERMS, and STARS statistics was presented. Information is available at <http://www.nd.gov/cjis/Committees/Executive.htm>
- LERMS integration is in the test phase. Issues were resolved by Motorola, allowing us to move on to user acceptance test by the end of this month or the first part of February. Did Gordon get in on fixing LERMS? Yes, some of it. They had some issues with submitting work orders. Gordon, none of those pieces are in production yet so it is still on the old system
- The Bismarck Police Department Integration project is around the same as last month, met with Dwight Offerman and need information from the vendor.
- CJIS Portal 2.0 - Effort to reduce cost for CJIS portal, Gordon is trying to make this a configuration option instead of development option. If it works out, costs could drop by about half. He has a business case and will be presenting it shortly

### **4. SAVIN Grant**

#### **1. Judiciary Committee Meeting results:**

- i. Stakeholder representatives and a victim testified on behalf of SAVIN, along with status, implementation and maintenance costs were presented to committee
- ii. Judiciary committee chose to move forth with full support for SAVIN. Pam contacted Rep. Lois Delmore, bill sponsor, to help on the

budget section

- iii. Victim notification was on the local news last night with positive comments
- iv. The 1.4 million dollar SAVIN grant will cover implementation and yearly costs presented to them for year 2 and 3. The committee was in full support of funding the SAVIN initiative.
- v. Lisa read the news article about SAVIN
- vi. Are Protection Orders and State Radio going to be integrated? Will these be able to interact?
  - 1. Yes, in the future, victims will have to register with VINE. Once they are registered, they will be notified for each change. They can register the same day as the crime occurs. Notifications can go out for over 10 years
  - 2. Where does this info come from? Hub for victims, they see the information. New information gets built for VINE. CJIS will need to be in the loop. Data field still happens in the same way.
- vii. If officers make a stop on State Radio, will they know if that suspect is heading towards a victim? Not at this time, it is not set up to provide that type of notification. This is for victim notification, not the officers. Database is pulled every 15 minutes, if change in status, and someone was registered, they would be notified. Are we creating an environment that victims feel they are registered, therefore safe? Would be helpful if officers would have that person flagged if stopped
- viii. Rules based on data will need to be defined in the system, victim will be notified. They can contact sheriff department to see how the suspect reacted.
- ix. Can law enforcement find out if the suspect is being reported on? Victim coordinator can use text as point of reference of how that person reacted at release
- x. Be sure not to raise expectations beyond what we can provide. We can issue cards to victims to give them all info to allow them to register. Should look at interfacing both back to law enforcement and forth to the victims to alert officers if there are victims wanting to know about people who are stopped
- xi. Surprised that the Judiciary Committee took the vote that day
  - 1. Pam thought the vote would take place after we left, but they were losing members. Nancy stated Pam did a good job of orchestrating and getting the right people there.
  - 2. Is there something in the works to change the section of the law which requires law enforcement to notify victims? One of the things we have to do is to go through the law and see how those things are mandated. This needs to change in the next session. We are going to try and use the fiscal note as we move that language. Should we have someone at AG's office looking at this? The legislative committee is studying this, but must be more proactive and there is a need to have advocacy groups involved. Should we start now or wait for the budget? Do we need to go do it now or wait for budget? I would be helpful for the AG's office to drive the letter and put it in front of Judiciary Committee. It really needs to be done by this committee, stand out in a separate bill draft rather than our

budget. Chuck will approach Vonette Richer from Legislative Council for this and to go through the century code

- xii. There is support for VINE; they were pushing for it before CJIS applied for grant. They have seen it work in other states. The victim is victim is responsible for keeping data current. We may need to update the contact list with a canned message to all victims to update their information once a year or so. This would also allow people out of state to have this information. Contract negotiations must take place; reality is we cannot write anything this massive. We have people who are experts at interfaces. Is the vendor going to hold us hostage once we are there? Pam contacted Iowa; Appriss has been responsible with their costs.
- xiii. The idea is when we write an RFP, we are looking for them to provide the "hooks" (interfaces)

## 2. SAVIN Governance Committee

- i. Currently we have defined the advisory group as a working group. There is a need for a project executive steering committee.
- ii. The Business Case paper was distributed. The project must go through Large Project Oversight since the project is over \$250,000
- iii. Project Charter (draft) was distributed
  - 1. Roles involved with the project, need SAVIN Governance Committee as a hands on group
  - 2. Pam went over the draft organization chart and asked for input. We have been using advisory group, do we need a separate SAVIN Executive Steering Committee. The group stated with LERMS we had a users group. They had a vested interest in the service. They would have better advisory group if the people in that group would be users as well
  - 3. Lisa thinks it needs to come from this committee here today, like it is now
  - 4. Board agrees to line up a governance board with the CJIS Executive Committee, this would allow ideas to come to this board
  - 5. Depends on the level of decisions and processes of stakeholder input. The board wants to hear if there is a change in budget or legislation. There will also be decisions that affect police officers in terms of notification that the board is not very informed about. The project will have to have enough representation and support to go through the committee. These others decision like day to day, need to be made by the SAVIN Governance Committee to allow this project to move forward
  - 6. Shouldn't standings be: Board at the top then this Executive Committee?
- iv. The other piece is the board needs to expand and add more people from this committee on the board and this raises the next issue to address next week: strategic planning and the role of this board, where it's going to flow. Paul would like to see the CJIS Executive below board so information flows up through this committee, then up further to the board
- v. Nancy worries if it's financial or legal the Board would want the decision and Anything below the Board would hand off to the

- Executive Committee and down from there
- vi. This is still a draft leading up to next week. We will need to come up with something and approve it
  - vii. To apply for grants, this will be important. Pam is looking to see where the overlapping roles appear in the process.
  - viii. Chuck, Appriss is going to want to hit the ground and go forward. The board has seen the draft project charter and now we've seen it. What was board's discussion? There was not enough time to go over. The board was going to review.
  - ix. Paul, overall flowchart should have us (EC) higher in that line, add Bismarck Law Enforcement, if some projects need additional input, we can pull their advice

## **5. State Radio Discussions**

- Working with IJIS, an independent consultant institute sponsored by BJA to review State Radio and CJIS's overlap. This came from a meeting with the Adjutant General in December. The outcome of that meeting was to see the overlaps and what can be done. Hopefully they will offer a solution so we can move forward. On Monday Gordon is having a meeting with State Radio to review their services. The Adjutant Gen asked for documentation to show the overlap. Questions rose by the Executive Committee; 1) Homeland Security grant issues? 2) Will this have them taking over everything?

## **6. CJIS Strategic Planning - January 16, 2008**

- A new business plan will be sent to everyone and would like everyone's input. Where can CJIS go and what can it do for your area.
- Will the board be there? No they would like this group to see it first. The committee felt it was imperative for board members who can be there to show up.
- The Sheriff's meeting is the same day, may lose those in the afternoon to that meeting. A suggestion to change to 9-12 on January 16th and 1-4 on January 17th if the 16<sup>th</sup> doesn't a lot enough time

## **7. Discussion/issues**

- State Radio has received notification of rates going up, new fee structure
- Brought up issues of people buying air cards and using CJIS
- About a \$12K/year raise cost
- Maximus financial report was based on total user fees, enterprise fund, ignoring the states obligation to provide
- Hope they don't blindly accept this fee, fees would be in play by January 1 of 2009
- We pay \$20/mo to run checks and for communication charged per NBC (ID) number. They would be raising to \$105/mo per NBC
- Air card
  - i. Are these cards available in the same speed in smaller places? Maybe not the same speed but it is available
  - ii. The cost is around \$40/month and ties into CJIS which allows more information to be obtained.
  - iii. Our guys are calling in the plate and dispatchers are entering it. They can't do this on NBCs. The last couple days the tele-system has been down and we've been getting faster and more info from CJIS

- Consultants recommendation, is to totally fund state radio but if that is the case, it may not work out
- There are other options and solutions, will be discussed on Wednesday
- Lisa hadn't heard about the rising of the rates
- State Radio works great for the governor communications but not for what we are working on obtaining

8. LERMS integration is hoping to go live on January 29<sup>th</sup>, may be postponed a couple days due to testing

- LERMS Contracts - When people signed up they signed up for a 3 years. With the addition of sharing information from LERMS the contract has been amended to include the sharing of data. For those that did not have an expired contract an addendum was sent. The addendum was sent to the LERMS customers with contracts in place and 2 new contracts to the expired customers. Pam asked should we go live if the contracts/addendums are not returned by the 29<sup>th</sup> or implementation date. It was asked if we designed the system to flag those that did not want to share. No, as the LERMS user group determined not to based on costs and the goals of sharing information.
- Pat makes a Motion to send new contracts that say if they are not signed by the 29<sup>th</sup> If you are willing to pay we will share your data. They would then be off the LERMS system but can always sign up later. This would allow us to go ahead with the go live date. If they do not wish to share their data we must be notified in writing.
- Pat withdraws his original motion
- **Jerry made a motion to send a letter to all expired contracts; that states if they do not sign, they will no longer be a part of LERMS. Pat seconds. Motion carried**
- **Nancy motions to send a letter to the other four active contracts to say: On January 29<sup>th</sup>, due to integration project, all data will be available to anyone. If you do not wish to have your data shared by January 29<sup>th</sup>, we need notification in writing or we will continue to share your data. Pat seconds. Motion Approved.**
- If issues arise from the contracts, will need to address at that point. Impacts may affect revenues and costs.

9. Review CJIS Hub user requests

- **Jerry made a motion to accept this request. Pat seconds. Motion carried. Motion approved**

10. Discussion

- In reference to the increase for State Radio, what is the time frame? Is this increase gradual or all at once? This is not an easy process, need to plan 18 months prior to implementation
- We have three year contracts in CJIS, thus currently we are bound to the fee structure set up in the contract. We could look at cold bill in reverse
- Prorate out contracts to renew at the same time, or address fee structure in another way.

**Adjourned 3:00**